

C3SR claims to be representing satellite radio customers. Here is proof positive that they do not, and that they have misrepresented themselves to the commission.

C3SR has demanded a hearing with the FCC regarding the proposed merger of Sirius and XM. In their filing they charge Sirius and XM with a “lack of candor” with regard to an interoperable radio device.

Candor?

Exactly how much candor has C3SR had?

From what information is available, C3SR funded by the National Association of Broadcasters, and the founders have ties to the NAB.

Here is what C3SR Claims:

“Through the participation and support of subscribers and volunteers, C3SR -the only consumer group in existence today solely dedicated to advocating on behalf of satellite radio subscribers- is committed to opposing the creation of a monopoly in satellite radio, and ensure continued consumer choice and competition.”

1. As a subscriber I have never supported C3SR, and have never had contact with anyone who has. In publishing this site, I come in contact with MANY subscribers. A subscriber that is a C3SR supporter may be harder to find than Bin Laden!!!

2. Support of volunteers? Exactly how many volunteers would that be? Does the NAB count as a volunteer? It has been well documented that the NAB finances a great majority of what C3SR does.

3. C3SR is the ONLY consumer group in existence dedicated solely to advocating on behalf of subscribers? Give me a break. I have asked time and time again for C3SR to step up to the plate and show their “membership” I have stated many times that in order to advocate for a group, you must understand that group. Subscribers WANT THE MERGER. If C3SR were advocating on behalf of subscribers, they would not be taking the stance they are. They are not doing anything for the benefit of subscribers. They are doing what appears to be the bidding of the NAB.

4. Wouldn't an organization that is advocating on behalf of subscribers be taking a stance on a proposal such as what Georgetown Partners has made? What about the Public Knowledge proposal? Media Access Project? Ibiqity? How can they be “advocating” if they are not even addressing the issues that surround the merger discussion?

5. Wouldn't an organization that claims to be an advocate of subscribers conduct some sort of research on what those subscribers want? C3SR HAS NEVER TAKEN ANY STEP IN SEEING THE SUBSCRIBERS OPINION.

6. Why does C3SR sensor opposing views on their website? I have had literally dozens of people tell me that their comments are not published. It seems that only comments critical of the merger, or of either company individually get published. As of this writing C3SR has had a total of 7 posts on their blog, and have only published 4 comments. This can mean that C3SR is irrelevant, and it could also mean that they simply want only certain types of comments. If only certain types of comments are desired, then one can clearly see that C3SR must indeed be irrelevant. In fact, I would like every reader to post a comment on the C3SR blog, and then post the identical comment here on this post referencing that you tried to post this on C3SR. Lets see if they are paying attention. Will they publish the comments? Of course, I run the risk of showing myself as irrelevant if no one participates, but.....I am willing to do just that.

So while the interoperable device has had a place in SDARS history, and there have been many opinions surrounding the issue, it boils down to this. Sirius and XM have filed with the FCC that they complied with the interoperable mandate. The FCC has not said one way or the other whether this is indeed the case. The issue is with the FCC. It is up to the FCC to decide whether or not the companies have complied. My opinion, your opinion, Sirius' opinion, XM's opinion and C3SR's opinion do not matter. It is the FCC's opinion that matters. Sirius and XM claim to have complied, and the FCC has not said anything one way or the other. Until such time that the FCC makes a statement one way or the other, the point is virtually moot. The record has shown that the number of subscribers that have both services is not very large, and it goes without saying that a great deal of those that have both are in a situation where one family member has a car with Sirius, while the other has XM. Thus they are paying \$26 per month instead of \$20 (family plan). If an interoperable device were brought to market and you had to buy both services with it, how many would actually subscribe? Realistically.....not many. An interoperable device that let's you choose 1 service would have more takers, but switching between services would be something that simply does not happen. People get exposed to one service or the other, they make their choice, and they stick with it. Plain and simple.

So, where is the lack of Candor? Does C3SR have candor? In my opinion they do not. They have never really made an effort for subscribers. Instead, their objective seems to be whatever the National Association of Broadcasters wants. In other words, they are in my opinion a "PUPPET ORGANIZATION". Notice that neither C3SR nor the NAB have ever commented on some of the various proposals that have been presented to the FCC.

Aaron Said on May 28th, 2008 at 12:58 am

This is the comment I posted under the "Why Subscribers Will Lose" article:

I for one am a subscriber who feels that subscribers will WIN when the FCC approves the merger. A merged XM/Sirius will offer more programming choices and a la carte channel packages. Both of those are clearly better for consumers.

It said that moderator approval is turned on...so "they" will have to approve my post.

Joe Said on May 28th, 2008 at 12:59 am

Submitted at 12:58am 05/28/2008

Don't purport to represent me. I am a subscriber who strongly believes in this merger. It is in the best interest of radio for this to occur. A merged company has promised Ala Carte, lower pricing and more of a selection. A merged company increases competition to terrestrial radio and forces them to "raise the bar". Explain to me how this is not in the "public interest" or interests of subscribers??

SiriusIntentions Said on May 28th, 2008 at 12:59 am

I would really like to see a merger as I think it provides benefits to the public and every subscriber in the sense that it offers more programming or less programming at attractive rates.

It gives me the opportunity to listen to what I want.

Joe Said on May 28th, 2008 at 1:04 am

Also...."Why does C3SR censor opposing views on their website?"

should read "Why does C3SR censor opposing views on their website"

Why does the FCC entertain these various branches of the NAB? I thought that the NAB is only allowed to be represented to the FCC as one organization.

Jack Said on May 28th, 2008 at 3:10 am

Probably wasting your time. C3SR is clearly a sham organization. Moderators even says they review everything before approval. It probably would be best not to even give them any recognition or publicity...

I did submit a post...

It looks to me like you are indeed a puppet organization. I see no negative comments even though most subscribers are in favor of the merger including myself. You do NOT represent me!

How do you sleep at night? Political scum...

trevor Said on May 28th, 2008 at 3:42 am

THANK YOU for this!!

I tried posting a comment on c3sr and it was censored.

I tried to send then feedback and they make you register and your comments are limited to 255 chars. also you find out the hard way... it rejects your submission and bounces you back to an empty form which you have to fill out all over again.

C3SR is a total sham!!!

Tristan28 Said on May 28th, 2008 at 6:54 am

I posted my opinion and received the message,  
"Your comment has been saved and will be visible after blog owner approval."

I doubt my comment will meet the “blog owner approval.”

This is a copy of my post:

When the SDARS licenses were issued in 1997 it stated they had to develop an interoperable radio. Where does it state the companies had to bring these radios to the market? Who would pay all of the money to subsidize these radios in order to make them affordable to consumers when neither company could be guaranteed they would have a new subscriber?

Sirius and XM did not violate a condition of their licenses just because they did not bring interoperable radios to the market. They developed an interoperable radio. It is sitting on Mel Karmazin's desk. This is all the license stated they had to do. So the argument that the companies should not be allowed to merge because they did not bring interoperable radios to market is nonsense.

If the companies had been able to some how begin broadcasting in 1997, immediately after the licenses were issued, it is safe to assume that they would have captured more than the 3% to 4% of the market share they have now. I could not imagine ten years ago satellite radio coming to the market and the two companies not capturing a large share of it. So yes, in 1997 these two companies merging would have been a monopoly. That was the whole point of the clause preventing the two companies from merging. No one could have imagined that in a few years Apple Inc. was about to change the audio entertainment industry forever and the revolution that would follow.

In regards to Sirius and XM's current market share, what do you think would happen if they raised subscription prices? They certainly would not gain market share because their prices went up. Even at current subscription prices they only have 3% to 4% market share. If Sirius and XM merging creates a monopoly, where are the other 96% to 97% of the market getting their audio entertainment? Or do they just sit their in complete silence?

For those of you who believe this merger creates a monopoly, you are living in the past.

Marc Wright Said on May 28th, 2008 at 7:03 am

Tyler - I just posted on the C3SR Website under the article "Why approve the merger?" See my post below:

C3SR - YOU DO NOT REPRESENT THE SUBSCRIBERS!!!!!!! I as a subscriber to Sirius would like the option of tiered pricing as well as access to the content of XM, without having to purchase both services. You are nothing more than a puppet for the NAB. Get lost. You are a waste of time and space.

Tom Said on May 28th, 2008 at 8:06 am

Martin is a puppet. He needs to get off his lazy self serving ass & make a decision about this merger. He is doing what his office is suppose to be protecting against. There are a lot of behind the scene forces working to hurt Sat Rad. Can you say NAB???? Kevin Martin you should be ashamed of yourself for letting this thing get so far.

Bright\_One Said on May 28th, 2008 at 8:31 am

With all this talk about an interoperable radios I have to ask then what is the radio below?

The first siri/xm HD Radio RADIO:(that nobody wanted)

<http://gizmodo.com/gadgets/home-entertainment/onkyo-debuts-worlds-first-xm-sirius-hd-radio-tuner-254920.php>

Dominick Said on May 28th, 2008 at 8:50 am

I just wanted to state the obvious:

If they are demanding a meeting publicly, it could only be for one reason; The FCC won't give them one...

Dan Said on May 28th, 2008 at 9:08 am

Just emailed psoted on the C3SR blog, let's see if it gets posted:

I don't believe the subscribers will lose. I've seen the proposal of packages SIRI submitted to the FCC and would be very willing to pay the full amount for nearly 300 stations including NFL, MLB, NHL, NASCAR, etc... I am certain the majority of truckers and others who are on the road more than an hour a day would be glad to pay the same. Satellite radio is God's gift to the road warrior and the more selection the better. I don't believe C3SR is on our side as consumers. I personally hate commercials and having to change channels every 30 minutes.

Sam Said on May 28th, 2008 at 10:08 am

Here's what I posted:

Can we please get some up-to-date information on here? Everything seems to be written by one source that is against the merger. What about those of us who believe that the merger will be good?

I personally would benefit from being able to have my Sirius lineup plus baseball at a much lower cost than subscribing to both services.

Dominick Said on May 28th, 2008 at 10:42 am

here's a dual operable radio that has been out since 2003...I don't think they sold a single one...

[http://www.visteon.com/products/automotive/satellite\\_radio.html](http://www.visteon.com/products/automotive/satellite_radio.html)

C3SR Rremoves Blog Link From Their Landing Page - SiriusBuzz Said on May 28th, 2008 at 11:05 am

[...] be removed entirely, readers can still voice the opinion to C3SR here on Sirius Buzz our article

C3SR Demands Hearing With FCC . C3SR will likely see the comments, because given their actions today, it would appear that they [...]

Well, that was fast. While it may be a simple coincidence, C3SR has now removed the link to their blog from their landing page. In fact, there is now no way to arrive at the C3SR blog section of the site at all. Of course, you can still get to the blogs by using the link that Sirius Buzz provided.

In response to what appeared to be censorship of pro-merger comments on the C3SR blog, we encouraged readers to attempt to submit their comments concerning the merger and then post their comments here on Sirius Buzz as well.

Several have tried to post comments to C3SR and as yet nothing none have been published by C3SR. That task is now more difficult because C3SR is now hiding the existence of the blog.

No worries though, as you can still arrive at the C3SR blog through [THIS LINK](#) ....at least for now.

If C3SR had candor as an organization that claims to advocate on behalf of subscribers, one would certainly think that they would not hide information or censor the comments.

Pulling the links to their own blog is yet another example of the agenda that C3SR has.

So, it appears that the test of C3SR's candor is already bearing fruit. Should the blog section be removed entirely, readers can still voice the opinion to C3SR here on Sirius Buzz our article [C3SR Demands Hearing With FCC](#) . C3SR will likely see the comments, because given their actions today, it would appear that they read Sirius Buzz.

12 Responses to "C3SR Removes Blog Link From Their Landing Page"

Aaron Said on May 28th, 2008 at 11:54 am

This is ridiculous. If the FCC grants them a meeting...then I want a meeting with the FCC!

I am a consumer and not only does that non-transparent, NAB supported group not represent me, but their deceptive practices are anti-American.

Dominick Said on May 28th, 2008 at 12:42 pm



Good job Tyler!!!!!!!!!!

I hope you intend to forward these results to the FCC and Sirius' Attorney's!

Tyler Savery Said on May 28th, 2008 at 12:44 pm

Dominick,

I do not forward my own articles to the FCC, but do not object if others want to do so. I am sure Sirius is very up to speed on C3SR

trevor Said on May 28th, 2008 at 1:07 pm

Awesome! - I love how these guys think they can manipulate the media to make it look like they have public approval. but NOPE! We the people will not stand for it!!!

I still think the FCC will cave to political pressure and kill the merger, but theres no way they will get away with it without everyone knowing what a corrupt organization it is.

But maybe....just maybe there are enough people in the FCC with a fragment of conscience left who will do the right thing...

trevor Said on May 28th, 2008 at 1:19 pm

One other blatant fact about c3sr's news archive is that there is a long list of articles which are 100% anti merger.

The fact that you have to register to comment on any of the articles as well as pass moderator approval is complete censorship.

These people are living in the media stone age where they are used to being masters of the information....er propaganda.

amazing!

Even Siriusbuzz and orbitcast post opposing views to their pro merger stance. And they allow immediate commenting without forcing people to register.

Tyler Savery Said on May 28th, 2008 at 1:24 pm

trevor....

small correction.

At Sirius buzz, comments do go through a moderation phase. However, once you have been approved for one comment, any other comments you make from that point forward will be directly posted without moderation.

This site receives about a thousand comments per day. A huge number of those are pure spam, and thus we do not publish them.

I do not censor opinions though, and even if someone is critical of me or a position I take, their comments get published.

wgwright2 Said on May 28th, 2008 at 1:35 pm

I wanted to post the following on the C3SR blogs, but can't figure out how to do it. If anyone has been successful, please feel free to cut and paste this onto their blogs on my behalf:

C3SR has no shame?

In the conclusion section of their last filing, C3SR urges the FCC to do the following:

“Separately, the Commission should initiate a proceeding to determine whether to revoke the licenses of both SIRIUS and XM for a failure to comply with interoperable receiver condition.”

Now that's the way to look out for satellite consumers' well-being: make sure they can't get satrad at all. If they are still trying to claim they are a “consumer coalition”, they are doing a really bad job of looking the part.

[http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native\\_or\\_pdf=pdf&id\\_document=6520011258](http://fjallfoss.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6520011258)

wgwright2 Said on May 28th, 2008 at 1:55 pm

Correction. I was able to submit to the C3SR blogs. Pigs will fly before they post this consumer's opinion, though.

trevor Said on May 28th, 2008 at 1:57 pm

Here is an e-mail I sent to C3SR that i am sure is a bogus address: info@c3sr.org

"You should be ashamed of yourselves.....uh nevermind that's impossible. You're a small group of lawyers representing big business.

C3SR has absolutely no interest in consumer opinions or rights.

You are a fake organization set up to push the NAB agenda under the guise of being a voice for the consumer.

Your website is a pathetic, useless, one way stream of corporate and government controlled propaganda.

you should be well aware of that from the firestorm of people you pissed off with your bogus FCC filing. those are the consumers you pretend to represent and yet not only do you ignore their comments, you suppress their voice completely.

Trevor Jordet

A legitimate consumer who is offended by your claim to represent me."

trevor Said on May 28th, 2008 at 1:58 pm

ha i just realised that the comments were reviewed, but they get posted so quickly that i did not notice

it before

wgwright2 Said on May 28th, 2008 at 2:22 pm

I just tried Savery's C3SR blog link again. I got redirected to their contact page. Looks like they plugged another hole.

Aaron Said on May 28th, 2008 at 6:10 pm

The following was sent to my elected officials through the [siriusmerger.com](http://siriusmerger.com) website regarding this situation:

Elected Officials:

I'd like to bring your attention to the following disturbing situation. It seems that a group named the Consumer Coalition for Competition in Satellite Radio filed a letter with the FCC on May 27, 2008 demanding a meeting with the FCC in order to make their case for denying the Sirius/XM merger.

This group purports to represent satellite radio consumers and is working against the approval of a Sirius/XM merger.

Not only does this group not represent me, but there are allegations that they are funded and supported by the NAB (National Association of Broadcasters). This is a deceptive practice that should be investigated.

I believe in the democracy of our country. What troubles me is the abuse of power and the way in which the NAB may be using deception to further their desire to stifle competition that a merged XM/Sirius would bring.

For your reference the following is an email I sent to the group via their website on May 28, 2008.

To Whom It May Concern at C3SR:

As a paying consumer of satellite radio I take offense to the way in which you run your organization and how you purport to represent me in the Sirius/XM merger matter.

Your mission statement on your main page states:

“Through the participation and support of subscribers and volunteers, C3SR -the only consumer group in existence today solely dedicated to advocating on behalf of satellite radio subscribers- is committed to opposing the creation of a monopoly in satellite radio, and ensure continued consumer choice and competition.”

Make no mistake. Your organization DOES NOT represent me or my beliefs about the Sirius/XM merger. You are not advocating on my behalf.

I attempted to post my thoughts on your website blog. However, my comments were never made visible to other site visitors and now the blog section of your site has been removed.

As a consumer who you claim to represent I demand that you make it clear that you, in fact, DO NOT advocate for me, but instead have chosen to stifle my beliefs and opinions I have in favor of the Sirius/XM merger.

I expect a timely response and prompt resolution to this unfortunate situation.